



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,477

04/08/2004

Yuka Hasegawa

P/1909-168

1055

2352 7590 06/10/2009
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte YUKA HASEGAWA

Application No. 10/821,477
Technology Center 2600

Mailed: June 10, 2009

Before PAMELA S. BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal*.
BENNETT, *Review Team Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on June 8, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matters requiring attention prior to docketing.

APPEAL BRIEF, SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellant filed an Appeal Brief dated August 25, 2006. The Appeal Brief is not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c) effective September 13, 2004.

According to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(v), an Appeal Brief must include the following:

(v) *Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter.* A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which must refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii), every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

The “Summary of claimed subject matter” appearing on pages 2 and 3 of the Appeal Brief filed August 25, 2006 is deficient because it does not separately map independent claims 13 and 20 to the specification. Correction is required.

MPEP § 1205.03 states in part:

(B) When the Office holds the brief to be defective solely due to appellant’s failure to provide a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v), an entire new brief need not, and should not, be filed. Rather, a paper providing a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) will suffice. Failure to timely respond to the Office’s

requirement will result in dismissal of the appeal.
See MPEP § 1215.04 and § 711.02(b).

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, MISSING CERTIFIED TRANSLATIONS

The Examiner relied on the foreign references to Nishimura (JP 07-115633), Saiki et al. (JP 11-234641) and Nakajima (JP 2003032727A) in rejecting the claims. While it is noted that the Examiner provided abstracts of the above-noted references with the Non-Final Rejection mailed September 13, 2005, full certified English translations of these references are needed.

When an Examiner relies on a document “in a language other than English, a translation *must* be obtained so that the record is clear as to the precise facts the examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection” (emphasis added). See §1207.02 of the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) (Eighth Edition, Rev. 5, August 2006). Pursuant to a memorandum dated April 29, 2002 by Stephen G. Kunin, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy:

Effective immediately, no appeal should be forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision where: (1) a rejection is supported in whole or part by an abstract without reference to the underlying document, . . . ; or (2) a rejection is supported in whole or part by a prior art document not in the English language, unless accompanied by a translation of the prior art document into English.

The memorandum also states “[i]f the document is in a language other than English and the examiner seeks to rely on that document, a translation *must* be obtained so that the record is clear as to the precise facts the examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection” (emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to hold the Appeal Brief filed August 25, 2006 defective, as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(d);
- 2) to notify the Appellant to submit a “paper” which corrects the Appeal Brief’s Summary of Claimed Subject Matter under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v);
- 3) to acknowledge and consider any “paper” submitted by Appellant to correct the Appeal Brief;
- 4) to obtain full certified English language translations of the above-noted foreign references (Nishimura (JP 07-115633), Saiki et al. (JP 11-234641) and Nakajima (JP 2003032727A));
- 5) to complete the Image File Wrapper (IFW) by having the translations obtained scanned into the IFW file;
- 6) to provide copies of the translations obtained to Appellant; and
- 7) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

PSB

Ostrolenk Faber Gerb & Soffen
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8403